

REMARKS

Claims 1-18 are pending. Claims 4, 7-9, 13 and 16-18 have been withdrawn from consideration by the Examiner for being directed to non-elected subject matter. By this Amendment, Claims 1 and 10 are amended. As support for the amendments to the claims can be found in the originally filed application, such as, for example, Figures 1-3B, and remaining amendments to the claims are made merely for cosmetic purposes, Applicants respectfully submit no new matter is presented herein.

Entry of Response Proper

Entry of this Amendment is proper under 37 C.F.R. §1.116 since the amendments: (a) place the application in condition for allowance for the reasons discussed herein; (b) do not raise any new issues requiring further search and/or consideration on the part of the Examiner as the amendments to Claims 1 and 10 merely clarify that another of the bushes is slidably provided to another of the straight portions along the axial direction; (c) satisfy a requirement of form asserted in the previous Office Action; (d) do not present any additional claims without canceling a corresponding number of finally rejected claims; and (e) place the application in better form for appeal, should an appeal be necessary. The Amendment is necessary and was not earlier presented because it is made in response to objections raised in the Final Rejection. Entry of the Amendment is thus respectfully requested.

Election/Restrictions

Applicants appreciate the acknowledgement by the Office Action that withdrawn claims may be considered upon the allowance of an independent claim. Applicants note the June 24 Response pointed out that Claims 1-2 and 10-11 are generic to all four (4) species identified in the Office Action dated May 25, 2005. Therefore, Applicants respectfully submit the application contains pending generic claims, that upon being deemed allowable and depending on any amendments made thereto, rejoinder of the non-elected claims is requested pursuant to 37 C.F.R. §1.141.

Claim Rejections – 35 U.S.C. §102

Claims 1-3, 5-6, 10-12 and 14-15 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. §102(b) as being anticipated by JP 11-210713 to Orihashi. Applicants respectfully traverse the rejection.

Claims 1 and 10 recite a stabilizer for vehicles and a method mounting the stabilizer to the vehicles, respectively, wherein the stabilizer includes a torsion portion extending in a width direction of a vehicle; arm portions extending in a forward or backward direction from opposite end portions of the torsion portion; straight portions provided proximate to the opposite end portions of the torsion portion, the straight portions extending along an axial direction thereof; end portions of the arm portions, the end portions of the arm portions being mounted to the vehicle, and the straight portions being mounted to the vehicle via bushes; and a stopper provided to ***one of the straight portions***, the stopper preventing one of the straight portions from moving more than a predetermined distance in the axial direction with respect to one of the bushes, which is provided to one of the straight portions, wherein ***another of the bushes is slidably provided to another of the straight portions along the axial direction***.

As noted above, the claimed invention recites that a stopper is provided to one of the straight portions and prevents one of the straight portions from moving more than a predetermined distance in the axial direction with respect to one of the bushes which is provided to one of the straight portions, and that another of the bushes is slidably provided to another of the straight portions along the axial direction. Applicants respectfully submit that since one of the bushes is held by the stopper on the stabilizer, it is easy to control the allowable range of the distance between the stopper and one of the bushes. This benefit was pointed out in the Remarks section of the Response dated December 22, 2005. When another of the bushes is mounted to the vehicle, since another of the bushes is slidably provided to another of the straight portions along the axial direction, mounting position of another of the bushes on the vehicle can be controlled. This benefit was also pointed out in the Remarks section of the Response dated December 22, 2005. Therefore, even if the allowable range of the distance is small, the claimed invention copes with any unevenness in the mounting position of the stopper on the stabilizer and any unevenness in mounting positions of the bushes on the vehicle. As a result, it is easy to mount the stabilizer to the vehicle. Furthermore, since the allowable range of the distance can be small, the sideslip distance of the stabilizer with the vehicle can be small.

In contrast, in Orihashi, stoppers are provided to both of the straight portions for holding both of the bushes thereon. Therefore, Orihashi differs from the claimed invention in which another of the bushes is slideably provided to another of the straight portions along the axial direction. In Orihashi, since both of the bushes are held by the stoppers on both of the straight portions, the above actions and the effects of the

present invention cannot be obtained. Applicants discussed this in the Remarks section of the Response dated December 22, 2005 as well.

As described above, Orihashi fails to teach each and every feature recited by Claims 1 and 10 of the instant application and fails to derive the benefits/advantages flowing therefrom.

As explained above, Orihashi fails to disclose or suggest each and every feature recited by Claims 1 and 10.

To qualify as prior art under 35 U.S.C. §102, a single reference must teach, i.e., identically describe, each feature of a rejected claim. As noted above, Orihashi does not disclose or suggest each and every feature of Claims 1 and 10. As such, Applicants respectfully submit Claims 1 and 10 are not anticipated, nor rendered obvious in view of, Orihashi and should be deemed allowable.

Claims 2-3 and 5-6 depend from Claim 1. Claims 11-12 and 14-15 depend from Claim 10. It is respectfully submitted that these dependent claims be deemed allowable for at least the same reasons Claims 1 and 10 are allowable as well as for the additional subject matter recited therein.

Applicants respectfully request withdrawal of the rejection.

Conclusion

In view of the foregoing, reconsideration of the application, withdrawal of the outstanding rejection, rejoinder of Claims 4, 7-9 and 16-18, allowance of the Claims 1-18, and the prompt issuance of a Notice of Allowability are respectfully solicited.

Should the Examiner believe anything further is desirable in order to place this application in better condition for allowance, the Examiner is requested to contact the undersigned at the telephone number listed below.

In the event this paper is not considered to be timely filed, the Applicants respectfully petition for an appropriate extension of time. Any fees for such an extension, together with any additional fees that may be due with respect to this paper, may be charged to counsel's Deposit Account No. 01-2300, **referencing docket number 108421-00077.**

Respectfully submitted,
ARENT FOX PLLC

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to read 'MO' followed by a stylized flourish.

Murat Ozgu
Attorney for Applicants
Registration No. 44,275

Customer No. 004372

1050 Connecticut Avenue, NW, Suite 400
Washington, DC 20036-5339
Telephone: (202) 857-6000

MO/elp